

Kirkland TMP Project-Level Screening Summary (Qualitative-based)

Goal	Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs)	Description	Rating
Get People Where They Need To Go	Person capacity	Project's ability to add person capacity. Sample scores = 3 (new bridge, added lane on busy arterial, additional headways in-demand transit route); 2 (new transit connection, intersection improvement, bike lanes); 1 (added roadway capacity on outskirts, dial-a-ride service)	1 to 3
	Removes barriers to walking, biking, or taking transit	Project eliminates barrier to walking, biking, or taking transit by closing a gap in the system or making facilities feel safer or more pleasant	1 to 3
	Supportive of CKC Master Plan	Project connects to or is supportive of CKC master plan.	1 to 3
	Links to regional destinations	Project helps connect travelers with regional transportation system (transit, state highways, etc)	1 to 3
	Operational safety	Project provides opportunity to rebuild high collision facility	Yes / No
Link to Land Use	Travel Demand Management (TDM)	Increase in TDM options (such as parking management)	1 to 3
	Jobs / housing balance	Supports access between employment centers and residential areas	1 to 3
	Consistency with character	Enhancing, consistent or disruptive to the neighborhood character	1 to 3
	Economic development measure	Supports regional or citywide access to identified growth centers	1 to 3
Be Sustainable	Connect key origins, destinations, and corridors	Supports travel around urban centers, schools, employment clusters, and mobility corridors	1 to 3
	Unique financing	Dedicated funding source such as impact fees; doesn't compete for GF revenues or more flexible funds.	Yes / No
	Funding availability	Percent of project funds already identified	1 to 3
	Addresses or reduces maintenance needs	Project's ability to address or reduce maintenance needs. Sample scores = 3 (ITS upgrades to signal, overlay, guard rail replacement); 2 (addition of bike/ped facilities, new transit service); 1 (roadway widening; construction of new structures).	1 to 3
	Environmental assessment	Level of environmental impact on air quality, water quality, noise level	1 to 3
Be An Active Partner	Analysis of vulnerable populations	Increased / decreased accommodation of transportation choices and mobility access for vulnerable populations	1 to 3
	Plan on books	Amount of planning / design / engineering performed to date (high/medium/low)	1 to 3
	Coordination with other entities	Ability to seek funding, guidance, or input from surrounding jurisdictions, state, federal, or other agencies, including the private sector (high/medium/low)	1 to 3
	Community support	Presence of the project on a neighborhood plan	Yes / No
	Supportive of regional transit vision	Project forwards goal of enhancing Sound Transit facilities in Kirkland	1 to 3

Rating	Level of Improvement
3	Positive / High
2	Neutral / Medium
1	Negative / Low

Kirkland TMP Program/Alternative-Level Screening Summary (Quantitative and Qualitative-based)

Goal	MOEs	Description	Rating
Get People Where They Need To Go	Multi-modal System Person Capacity	Systemwide person throughput (travel model estimate of person miles + transit forecasts)	Person-miles
	VMT	System vehicle miles traveled	Vehicle-miles
	Average Trip Travel Time for SOV, HOV and Transit	Average trip travel time for SOV, HOV and Transit between 10 key urban center pairs	Average travel time
	Level of Service	LOS for each mode, perhaps a citywide or area average	LOS
	Route Options	Number of route options across 10 screenlines (include trails, vehicle lanes, transit route, etc) - GIS exercise?	Number of routes
	Non-SOV Mode Split	Increased non-SOV citywide and subarea mode splits	Mode split
	Bike Connectivity	Bike facilities per cap	Linear feet per capita
	Ped Connectivity	Ped facilities per cap	Linear feet per capita
Link To Land Use	Operational Safety	Percent high collision locations rebuilt	Percent rebuilt
	Freight Mobility	Travel time between distribution centers and 3 key destinations in city	Average travel time
	Consistency with Character	Enhancing, consistent, or disruptive to the neighborhood character	Qualitative
	Connect Key Origins, Destinations, and Corridors	Percent of projects located in or adjacent to urban centers, schools, or employment clusters	Percent inside / near
Be Sustainable	Unique Financing	Percent of project funding from dedicated funding source such as impact fees	Percent with dedicated funds
	Funding Availability	Percent of project funds already identified	Percent funded
	Capital Costs	Annualized capital costs	Cost in dollars
	Operating Costs	Annual operating + maintenance (O+M) costs	Cost in dollars
	Infrastructure Utilization	Utilization rates of existing facilities	Percent utilization
	Environmental Assessment	CO2, criteria air pollutants, and water pollutants reduction as a function of VMT	Volume reduced
Be An Active Partner	Analysis of Vulnerable Populations	Transport choices and mobility access for vulnerable populations (proximity of projects to populations, GIS activity)	Average distance
	Percent of Plans On the Books	Review of capital project lists	Percent on the books
	Percent of Projects Funded	Review of capital budgets	Percent funded
	Supportive of Regional Transit Vision	Amount of coordination with other jurisdictions	Percent allowing coordination